

Centers and Corridors Parking Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting #4 - Notes

February 26, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

SAC members in attendance: Allen Field, Chris Smith, Gail Hoffnagle, Gerik Kransky, James Kautz, Kay Newell, Mike Westling, Sean Green, Steve Russell, Sue Pearce, Tamara Deridder, Tony Jordan, William Gregg, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Kristin Slavin, Rod Merrick, Kurt Norback, Don Wood, Jo Shaeffer, Don Wood

SAC members not in attendance: Alex Cooley, Rebecca Kennedy, Carol Gossett, Mary McCurdy, Ted Labbe, Gary Davenport, Rick Michaelson, Pablo Bravo, Oreatha Johnson

City Staff in attendance: Colleen Caldwell, Sarah Figliozzi, Judith Gray, Peter Hurley, Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Morehead, Kel Sills (Bureau of Transportation) Eric Engstrom (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability)

The meeting began with quick introductions from SAC and Staff members.

Project Update from Grant

Jo Shaeffer will now be representing the Hollywood Neighborhood Association. Ian Stude will also no longer be representing the Bicycle Advisory Committee. He will appoint a replacement.

Our contract for the data collection is finalized, just waiting on the City attorney's signature. Data is scheduled to be done in March.

Due to the data collection and data analysis timeline, and because the last Thursday in March is Spring Break, there will be no meeting in March. The next meeting is scheduled for April 30.

There was an update from SAC Member Chris Smith informing the group that the Planning & Sustainability Commission is currently holding public hearings to review the Comprehensive Plan.

PBOT staff member Peter Hurley gave a presentation on Transportation Demand Management (TDM).

Questions & Comments:

Question: How does a TDM plan tackle issues in a mixed use building?

Staff Response: We typically work with developers and business owners to provide them with a list of potential options for their TDM plan, from which the developer/business can choose the options that best fit their situation and their desired management goals. These include providing information regarding available transit options in their areas. Information regarding incentives is also provided.

Comment: TDM focuses primarily on trip reduction, but maybe targeting car ownership would also be a good TDM target.

Staff Response: Yes, we agree, and this has been developed in recent TDM plans from other cities. Portland is hoping to explore this option along with trip reduction strategies.

Question: Does TDM take into account things such as telecommuting and e-commerce? It seems like advocating for these would be a great tool to reduce trips.

Staff Response: Yes, this is one of the menu items we give to developer/businesses.

Follow-up Question: Is the City looking into requirements for broadband internet speed as a method to help accomplish this?

Staff Response: This issue has come up before, and the type of broadband we will require is part of the Comprehensive Plan.

SAC Member Response: The City does have a Broadband Plan, but it is not linked to the Comp Plan.

Comment: It might be helpful, especially for multi-family residential buildings to have education information on the actual cost of owning a vehicle compared to the cost of other forms of transit.

Question: Will the City look into requiring incentives for non-auto commute, particularly things like cash-out programs?

Staff Response: Yes, that would be an element in a typical TDM menu.

Question: What is the threshold that Portland is looking at in terms of residential units before TDM requirements would kick in? And would TDM requirements be on an individual building level, or more of a geographic approach?

Staff Response: Based on the estimated number of trip reductions of 100 – 200 per day, we estimate that residential buildings with 10 – 20 units would need TDM plans. We would like to see more of an area-wide approach, similar to a cooperative of buildings, which would provide TDM assistance as a group. We believe that having this support system of other buildings would encourage the most active participation.

Question: The State of Washington seems to be much farther ahead on TDM requirements than we are, and they have an entire plan in place to help with this. Is Portland looking to develop a comprehensive plan?

Staff Response: Yes, we are hoping to, but it would be more like a methodology, in order to allow flexibility for site specific TDM management.

Question: The cost structure for a TDM plan is more like a long-term operations and management cost and a short term capital cost. It seems like there would be the likelihood of TDM plan being developed but then not followed after a certain period of time. Has the City had any experience with ensuring that TDM plans are followed over long periods?

Staff Response: The State of Oregon currently has a form that locations are required to fill out annually in order to assess their performance. We would like to see this continue, as well as some sort of area wide management groups to help support long term adherence to TDM plans.

PBOT staff member Sarah Figliozzi gave a presentation on bike parking requirements

Questions & Comments:

Comment: One of the biggest issues recently with bike parking seems to be that there isn't enough room for larger bikes or bikes with trailers. If we want to encourage bike use, especially with families with children, understanding and planning for size requirements is important.

Question: Many other cities encourage the use of 49CC motor bikes to help reduce traffic congestion and air quality issues, and they allow these motor bikes to park in the same area as bicycle parking. The City should look into this, and those types of motorbikes should be anticipated and encouraged

Staff Response: We believe that current state definition of a bike does not include motorbikes, which is why they are not allowed to park there now. But we will follow up and verify that definition, and look into this.

Question: Can you verify the statement made before, that new apartments are required to have long-term bike parking.

Staff Response: Yes, all new buildings (built or renovated) must have long-term parking.

Follow up Question: How is this enforced?

Staff Response: It goes through code review with the Bureau of Development Services.

Question: Do we have any data about whether people would bike more if there was more parking available?

Staff Response: We don't have any data from our city, there may be some from other places. We have heard many times anecdotally that yes, adequate supply of bike parking encourages more bike use.

Comment: There is the issue of developers requiring bike parking in the units themselves, can you explain this?

Staff Response: Prior to 2010 there was no requirement about whether or not long-term parking needed to be provided within a housing unit. Now there is a requirement that all units must have a 2 ft x 6 ft area for bike storage within the unit itself. But yes, this has led to some issues with storage and accessibility. We're looking into whether or not having this in-unit bike parking would count towards the long-term parking requirements for buildings.

Follow-up Response: The City needs to look into this particularly in the new micro apartments that are being developed. What is deemed as a "unit" if a micro apartment often has many bedrooms and occupants, and the unit requirements for long term bike parking are not adequate in these areas.

Question: Why is it that some developments have great parking facilities while some only meet the bare requirements?

Staff Response: It depends a lot on the desires of the developers. Some of them are very involved with the future uses of the buildings, other simply want to get by. It also depends on when the permits were approved, there have been a lot of changes in recent years, and some developed were required to have a lot more in terms of facilities.

Comment: Two of the biggest concerns regarding bike parking are security and weather protection

Question: What is the process and timeline for updating the bike parking code?

Staff Response: There will be code amendments with the Comprehensive Plan update, and this may be in the fall.

Follow-up Question: Will our work with parking mirror the timeline of the bike parking?

Staff Response: That is the current schedule.

Grant Morehead reviewed comments from the project goals that were from the previous meeting. The group voted unanimously that they approved the goals and there were no major changes needed.

Grant then reviewed the comments and broad themes from the last meeting regarding project outcomes that the SAC group would like to see.

Questions & Comments:

Comment: When discussing the best use of the Right of Way (ROW), it would be best to look at this from a community perspective. "Highest and best use" has too much of an economic connotation.

Comment: We need follow up from the staff about this ROW prioritization, who will be working on it, which SAC groups will work on it, what the timeline is. It seems like this issues keeps getting passed off from group to group and there has been no definitive response as to the scope and timeline from the City.

Staff Response: As a group discussing parking, we would like to touch on ROW valuation and prioritization, but it's a big issue to tackle. Valuation of the ROW is on PBOT's Two-Year Action plan, and it currently one of our highest priorities.

Comment: there was discussion about parking funds from an area being returned to that area in terms of transportation improvement funding. There needs to be caution though with equity issues. There might be the case that areas that generate the most revenue are areas that are already very developed and have fewer infrastructure deficiencies, compared to other areas that could definitely use more improvement. Just be wary of this issue.

Question: One of the things we talked about was possibly incentivizing apartment owners to reduce trips or reduce car ownership. Is there any coordination between this SAC group and the group work on the Mixed Use Zoning project?

Staff Response: Grant is currently helping with both projects, but TDM and parking issues are mostly dealt with in this group, not the Mixed Use group.

There was the chance for public comment. No public comment was given.

The meeting adjourned t 8:15 pm.
